arXiv:1409.3883v1 [math.DS] 12 Sep 2014

Periodic and Almost Periodic Random Inertial Manifolds for Non-Autonomous Stochastic Equations

Bixiang Wang
Department of Mathematics, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
Socorro, NM 87801, USA

Email: bwang@nmt.edu

Abstract

By the Lyapunov-Perron method, we prove the existence of random inertial manifolds for a class of equations driven simultaneously by non-autonomous deterministic and stochastic forcing. These invariant manifolds contain tempered pullback random attractors if such attractors exist. We also prove pathwise periodicity and almost periodicity of inertial manifolds when non-autonomous deterministic forcing is periodic and almost periodic in time, respectively.

Key words. Random inertial manifold, random invariant manifold, random attractor, periodic manifold, almost periodic manifold.

MSC 2010. Primary 35B40. Secondary 35B41, 37L30.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we investigate the existence of random inertial manifold (IM) for the following non-autonomous stochastic equation on a separable Hilbert space H for $t > \tau$ with $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\frac{du}{dt} + Au = F(u) + g(t) + \frac{dW}{dt} \quad \text{with} \quad u(\tau) = u_\tau, \tag{1.1}$$

where $A : D(A) \subseteq H \to H$ is a symmetric positive operator with compact inverse, F is a nonlinearity, g is a time-dependent external forcing, and W is a H-valued Wiener process on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$.

If g does not depend on time, then (1.1) is said to be an autonomous stochastic equation. The existence of IMs for autonomous random systems has been studied by experts in [2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12] and the references therein. For such a system, an IM is a random set $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(\omega) : \omega \in \Omega\}$ which is invariant, exponentially attracts all solutions, and is given by the graph of a finite-dimensional Lipschitz map. In the present paper, we want to consider the non-autonomous case where g varies in

time. It seems that there is no result reported in the literature on IMs when g is time-dependent. As we will see in Section 3, an IM for a non-autonomous stochastic equation is parametrized not only by $\omega \in \Omega$, but also by initial times $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. More precisely, an IM in this case is a finite-dimensional Lipschitz manifold $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ that is invariant and exponentially attracts all solutions. We will first prove the existence of such IMs for equation (1.1) in Section 3 under the classical gap condition. We will also prove that these IMs must contain tempered pullback random attractors if such an attractor exists. In addition, we will investigate the dependence of IMs on the external forcing g. If g is almost periodic, we show the random IMs are pathwise almost periodic. We will also prove pathwise periodicity of IMs when g is periodic in time.

We remark that constructions of random IMs are quite similar to random invariant manifolds which have been investigated recently in [1, 4, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17]. Of course, for IMs, one must establish the exponential attracting property which is also called the asymptotic completeness of IMs. Interestingly enough, the proof of asymptotic completeness is often based on similar arguments for constructing IMs but under even more restrictive conditions.

In the next section, we review some concepts of random dynamical systems and define IMs for non-autonomous stochastic equations. Section 3 is devoted to the existence of IMs for non-autonomous random systems under a gap condition. In the last section, we show the periodicity and almost periodicity of IMs when g is periodic and almost periodic in time, respectively.

2 Notation

In this section, we introduce the concept of random IMs for non-autonomous stochastic equations. The reader is referred to [2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12] on IMs for autonomous random systems.

Assume X is a separable Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|$, and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ is a metric dynamical system as in [1]. Let $D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ be a family of nonempty bounded subsets of X. Then D is said to be tempered if $\lim_{t\to-\infty} e^{ct}\|D(\tau + t, \theta_t\omega)\|_X = 0$ for every $c > 0$, where $\|D\|_X = \sup_{x\in D} \|x\|$. A family $D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ of nonempty closed subsets is said to be measurable if it is measurable in ω for each fixed τ. The following is the definition of cocycle for non-autonomous random equations.

Definition 2.1. Suppose Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \times X \to X$ satisfies, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t, s \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

(i) $\Phi(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega \times X \to X$ is $(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{B}(X),\ \mathcal{B}(X))$-measurable;

(ii) $\Phi(0, \tau, \omega, \cdot)$ is the identity on X;

(iii) $\Phi(t + s, \tau, \omega, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \tau + s, \theta_s\omega, \cdot) \circ \Phi(s, \tau, \omega, \cdot)$.

Such Φ is called a cocycle in X over $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. If, in addition, $\Phi(t,\tau,\omega,\cdot) : X \to X$ is continuous, then we say Φ is a continuous cocycle in X.

Definition 2.2. A measurable family $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ of subsets of X is called a random inertial manifold of Φ if the following conditions (i)-(iii) are satisfied:

(i) There exists a finite-dimensional subspace X_1 such that $X = X_1 \oplus X_2$ and there is a mapping $m : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \times X_1 \to X_2$ such that for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega) = \{x + m(\tau,\omega)(x) : x \in X_1\} \tag{2.1}$$

where $m(\tau,\omega)(x)$ is measurable in $\omega \in \Omega$ and is Lipschitz continuous in $x \in X_1$;

(ii) $\mathcal{M}$ is invariant: $\Phi(t,\tau,\omega,\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)) = \mathcal{M}(\tau+t,\theta_t\omega)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$;

(iii) $\mathcal{M}$ is asymptotically complete: for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $x \in X$, there exists $z = z(\tau,\omega,x) \in \mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$ such that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\|\Phi(t,\tau,\omega,x) - \Phi(t,\tau,\omega,z)\| \leq c_1 e^{-c_2 t},$$

where c_1 and c_2 are positive numbers depending on τ, ω and x.

Next, we define pathwise almost periodic random inertial manifolds. Let $g : \mathbb{R} \to X$ be a continuous function. Then g is said to be almost periodic (see, e.g., [18]) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a positive number $l = l(\varepsilon)$ such that every interval of length l contains a number t_0 for which $\|g(t+t_0) - g(t)\| < \varepsilon$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Motivated by almost periodic functions, we introduce the following concept.

Definition 2.3. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ be a random inertial manifold of Φ given by (2.1). Then $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be pathwise almost periodic if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive number $l = l(\varepsilon)$ such that any interval of length l contains a number τ_0 such that

$$\sup_{x\in X_1} \|m(\tau+\tau_0,\omega)(x) - m(\tau,\omega)(x)\| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all} \quad \tau \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \omega \in \Omega.$$

If there exists $T > 0$ such that $m(\tau+T,\omega)(x) = m(\tau,\omega)(x)$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $x \in X_1$, then $\mathcal{M}$ is called a pathwise periodic random inertial manifold with period T.

It is evident that if $\mathcal{M}$ is a T-periodic random inertial manifold in the sense of Definition 2.3, then $\mathcal{M}(\tau+T,\omega) = \mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. Similarly, if $\mathcal{M}$ is almost periodic, then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive number $l = l(\varepsilon)$ such that any interval of length l contains a number τ_0 such that for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$d^H(\mathcal{M}(\tau+\tau_0,\omega),\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad d^H(\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega),\mathcal{M}(\tau+\tau_0,\omega)) \leq \varepsilon, \tag{2.2}$$

where d^H is the Hausdorff semi-distance between two subsets of X. Note that (2.2) actually indicates the Hausdorff distance of $\mathcal{M}(\tau+\tau_0,\omega)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$ is controlled by ε.

3 Existence of Random Inertial Manifolds

In this section, we construct random inertial manifolds for the stochastic equation (1.1) in a separable Hilbert space H with norm $\|\cdot\|$. Assume that W in (1.1) is a two-sided H-valued Wiener process with covariance operator Q of trace class on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ where $\Omega = \{\omega \in C(\mathbb{R}, H) : \omega(0) = 0\}$ with compact-open topology, $\mathcal{F}$ is the Borel σ-algebra and P the Wiener measure. Suppose $A : D(A) \subseteq H \to H$ is a symmetric positive operator with compact inverse. Then H has an orthonormal basis $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ consisting of eigenvectors of A:

$$Ae_n = \lambda_n e_n, \quad 0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n \leq \cdots \quad \text{with} \ \ \lambda_n \to \infty.$$

Let $F : D(A^\alpha) \to H$ be a Lipschitz nonlinearity for some $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$; that is, there exists a positive constant L such that

$$F(0) = 0, \quad \|F(u_1) - F(u_2)\| \leq L\|A^\alpha(u_1 - u_2)\| \tag{3.1}$$

for all $u_1, u_2 \in D(A^\alpha)$. This implies that for all $u \in D(A^\alpha)$,

$$\|F(u)\| \leq L\|A^\alpha u\|. \tag{3.2}$$

For the non-autonomous term g in (1.1) we assume that $g \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, D(A^\alpha))$ and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda_1 s}\|A^\alpha g(s)\|ds < \infty, \tag{3.3}$$

where λ_1 is the first eigenvalue of A. These assumptions imply that for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda_1 s}\|A^\alpha g^\tau(s)\|ds < \infty, \tag{3.4}$$

where $g^\tau(\cdot) = g(\cdot + \tau)$ is the translation of g by τ.

Given an integer $n \geq 1$, let $P_n : H \to span\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ be the orthogonal projection and $Q_n = I - P_n$. Then we have (see, e.g., [5]) for all $u \in H$,

$$\|A^\alpha e^{-At} P_n u\| \leq \lambda_n^\alpha e^{-\lambda_n t}\|u\|, \quad t \leq 0, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\|e^{-At} Q_n u\| \leq e^{-\lambda_{n+1} t}\|u\|, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$\|A^\alpha e^{-At} Q_n u\| \leq \left(\alpha^\alpha t^{-\alpha} + \lambda_{n+1}^\alpha\right) e^{-\lambda_{n+1} t}\|u\|, \quad t > 0. \tag{3.7}$$

Note that $e^{-At} : P_n H \to P_n H$ is invertible for any $t \geq 0$, and its inverse is denoted by e^{At}. This means $e^{-At} : P_n H \to P_n H$ is defined for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a group of translations on Ω

given by: $\theta_t\omega(\cdot) = \omega(\cdot + t) - \omega(t)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ is a metric dynamical system as in [1]. Let $z : \Omega \to D(A^\alpha)$ be the unique stationary solution of

$$dz(\theta_t\omega) + Az(\theta_t\omega) = dW. \tag{3.8}$$

Then by [5], $z(\theta_t\omega)$ has a continuous version from $\mathbb{R}$ to $D(A^\alpha)$ for every fixed ω, and is tempered in the sense that for every $c > 0$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{t\to-\infty} e^{ct}\|A^\alpha z(\theta_t\omega)\| = 0.$$

In terms of (3.8), we can transfer the stochastic equation (1.1) into a pathwise random one by introducing a new variable $v(t) = u(t) - z(\theta_t\omega)$. By (1.1) and (3.8) we get

$$\frac{dv}{dt} + Av = F(v + z(\theta_t\omega)) + g(t), \quad t > \tau, \quad v(\tau) = v_\tau. \tag{3.9}$$

By (3.1) and the Banach fixed point theory as in [3], one can prove that for every $v_\tau \in D(A^\alpha)$ with $0 \le \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, problem (3.9) has a unique mild solution in $C([\tau, \infty), D(A^\alpha))$, which is measure in ω and continuous in v_τ in $(D(A^\alpha))$. To indicate the dependence on all related parameters, we write the solution of (3.9) as $v(t, \tau, \omega, g, v_\tau)$ which is given by

$$v(t, \tau, \omega, g, v_\tau) = e^{-A(t-\tau)}v_\tau + \int_\tau^t e^{-A(t-s)}\left(F(v(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s)\right) ds.$$

Let $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \times D(A^\alpha) \to D(A^\alpha)$ be a mapping given by, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+, \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega$ and $v_\tau \in D(A^\alpha)$,

$$\Psi(t, \tau, \omega, v_\tau) = v(t + \tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, g, v_\tau) = v(t, 0, \omega, g^\tau, v_\tau), \tag{3.10}$$

where $g^\tau(\cdot) = g(\cdot + \tau)$ as usual. Then we find that Ψ is a continuous cocycle over $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Note that if v is a solution of (3.9), then the process

$$u(t, \tau, \omega, g, u_\tau) = v(t, \tau, \omega, g, v_\tau) + z(\theta_t\omega) \quad \text{with} \quad u_\tau = v_\tau + z(\theta_\tau\omega) \tag{3.11}$$

is a mild solution of the stochastic equation (1.1). Based on this fact, we can define a continuous cocycle Φ for (1.1) by

$$\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, u_\tau) = u(t + \tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, g, u_\tau) \tag{3.12}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+, \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega$ and $u_\tau \in D(A^\alpha)$. By (3.10)-(3.12) we have

$$\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, u_\tau) = \Psi(t, \tau, \omega, u_\tau - z(\omega)) + z(\theta_t\omega). \tag{3.13}$$

We often need to replace g by g^τ on the right-hand side of (3.9) and conside the equation

$$\frac{dv}{dt} + Av = F(v + z(\theta_t\omega)) + g^\tau(t), \quad t > r, \quad v(r) = v_r. \tag{3.14}$$

The solution of (3.14) is given by, for $t \geq r$,

$$v(t, r, \omega, g^\tau, v_r) = e^{-A(t-r)} v_r + \int_r^t e^{-A(t-s)} \left(F(v(s) + z(\theta_s \omega)) + g(s+\tau) \right) ds. \tag{3.15}$$

Note that the solution of (3.14) is defined only for forward time $t \geq r$ in general. But we need to consider backward solutions when constructing inertial manifolds. For that purpose, we introduce the following concept of solutions defined on $(-\infty, 0]$.

Definition 3.1. Given $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, a continuous mapping $\xi : (-\infty, 0] \to D(A^\alpha)$ is called a mild solution of (3.14) on $(-\infty, 0]$ if $v(t, r, \omega, g^\tau, \xi(r)) = \xi(t)$ for all $r \leq t \leq 0$, where $v(t, r, \omega, g^\tau, \xi(r))$ is the unique solution of (3.14) with initial value $\xi(r)$.

We now assume that there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n \geq \frac{2L}{k} \left(\lambda_{n+1}^\alpha + \lambda_n^\alpha + c_\alpha (\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n)^\alpha \right) \quad \text{for some} \quad k \in (0, 1), \tag{3.16}$$

where c_α is a nonnegative number given by

$$c_\alpha = \alpha^\alpha \int_0^\infty s^{-\alpha} e^{-s} ds \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c_\alpha = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha = 0.$$

For convenience, we set

$$\mu = \lambda_n + \frac{2L}{k} \lambda_n^\alpha. \tag{3.17}$$

Then by (3.16) we have $\mu \in (\lambda_n, \lambda_{n+1})$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the Banach space defined by

$$\mathcal{S} = \{ \xi \in C((-\infty, 0], D(A^\alpha)) : \sup_{t \leq 0} e^{\mu t} \| A^\alpha \xi(t) \| < \infty \}$$

with norm $\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{S}} = \sup_{t \leq 0} e^{\mu t} \| A^\alpha \xi(t) \|$. Given $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\tau, \omega) &= \{ \xi(0) : \xi \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and is a mild solution of (3.14) on } (-\infty, 0] \text{ by Definition 3.1} \} \\ &= \{ \xi(0) : \xi \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } v(t, r, \omega, g^\tau, \xi(r)) = \xi(t) \text{ for all } r \leq t \leq 0 \}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

We will show $\mathcal{M} = \{ \mathcal{M}(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega \}$ is an inertial manifold of (3.14) for which we need:

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose* (3.1), (3.3) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold, and* $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$. *Then* ξ *is a mild solution of* (3.14) *on* $(-\infty, 0]$ *in the sense of Definition 3.1 if and only if there exists* $x \in P_n H$ *such that for all* $t \leq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(t) = e^{-At} x &- \int_t^0 e^{-A(t-s)} P_n \left(F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s \omega)) + g(s+\tau) \right) ds \\ &+ \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-A(t-s)} Q_n \left(F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s \omega)) + g(s+\tau) \right) ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Proof. Given $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ and $t \leq 0$, it is evident that the first integral on $(t, 0)$ in (3.19) is well-defined. We now prove the second integral on $(-\infty, t)$ exists. By (3.4), (3.6) and $\lambda_{n+1} \geq \lambda_1$ we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t} \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)} Q_n g(s+\tau)\| ds \leq \int_{-\infty}^{t} e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-s)} \|A^\alpha g(s+\tau)\| ds < \infty. \tag{3.20}$$

By (3.2) and (3.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-\infty}^{t} \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)} Q_n F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega))\| ds \\
&\leq L \int_{-\infty}^{t} \left(\frac{\alpha^\alpha}{(t-s)^\alpha} + \lambda_{n+1}^\alpha \right) e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-s)} \|\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} ds \\
&\leq L \|\xi + z(\theta_s\omega)\|_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{-\infty}^{t} \left(\frac{\alpha^\alpha}{(t-s)^\alpha} + \lambda_{n+1}^\alpha \right) e^{-\lambda_{n+1}t} e^{(\lambda_{n+1}-\mu)s} ds < \infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\mu < \lambda_{n+1}$ and the temperedness of z. By (3.20) and (3.21), the integrals in (3.19) we well-defined in $D(A^\alpha)$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ and $t \geq 0$. If $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ is a solution of (3.14) on $(-\infty, 0]$, then by (3.15) and Definition 3.1 we get for all $r < t \leq 0$,

$$\xi(t) = e^{-A(t-r)}\xi(r) + \int_r^t e^{-A(t-s)} (F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s+\tau)) ds,$$

which implies for all $r < t \leq 0$,

$$P_n\xi(t) = e^{-A(t-r)} P_n\xi(r) + \int_r^t e^{-A(t-s)} P_n (F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s+\tau)) ds, \tag{3.22}$$

and

$$Q_n\xi(t) = e^{-A(t-r)} Q_n\xi(r) + \int_r^t e^{-A(t-s)} Q_n (F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s+\tau)) ds. \tag{3.23}$$

We get from (3.22) for $t = 0$

$$P_n\xi(0) = e^{Ar} P_n\xi(r) + \int_r^0 e^{As} P_n (F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s+\tau)) ds$$

and hence

$$e^{-At} P_n\xi(0) = e^{-A(t-r)} P_n\xi(r) + \int_r^0 e^{-A(t-s)} P_n (F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s+\tau)) ds. \tag{3.24}$$

It follows from (3.22) and (3.24) that

$$P_n\xi(t) = e^{-At} P_n\xi(0) - \int_t^0 e^{-A(t-s)} P_n (F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s+\tau)) ds. \tag{3.25}$$

On the other hand, since $\mu \in (\lambda_n, \lambda_{n+1})$, by (3.6) we have for $r < t \leq 0$,

$$\|e^{-A(t-r)} Q_n\xi(r)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \leq e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-r)} \|\xi(r)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \leq e^{-\lambda_{n+1}t} e^{(\lambda_{n+1}-\mu)r} \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{S}} \to 0 \tag{3.26}$$

as $r \to -\infty$. Taking the limit of (3.23) as $r \to -\infty$, by (3.25) and the fact $\xi(t) = P_n\xi(t) + Q_n\xi(t)$ we find that ξ satisfies (3.19) with $x = P_n\xi(0)$.

Suppose now $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfies (3.19). Then by simple calculations, one can verify that for all $r \le t \le 0$, $v(t, r, \omega, g^\tau, \xi(r)) = \xi(t)$ and hence ξ is a solution of (3.14) on $(-\infty, 0]$. □

Next, we will find all solutions $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ of (3.14) on $(-\infty, 0]$ in order to characterize the structure of $\mathcal{M}$ given by (3.18). By Lemma 3.2, we only need to find all $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying (3.19). Given $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, $x \in P_nH$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$, denote by

$$\mathcal{I}(\xi, x, \omega, \tau)(t) = e^{-At}x - \int_t^0 e^{-A(t-s)}P_n\left(F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s+\tau)\right)ds$$

$$+ \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-A(t-s)}Q_n\left(F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s+\tau)\right)ds. \tag{3.27}$$

Then ξ satisfies (3.19) if and only if ξ is a fixed point of $\mathcal{I}$ in $\mathcal{S}$. We first show $\mathcal{I}$ maps $\mathcal{S}$ into itsself.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose* (3.1), (3.3) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold. Then for every fixed $x \in P_nH$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{I}(\cdot, x, \omega, \tau) : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{S}$ is well-defined.*

Proof. By (3.27) and (3.5)-(3.7) we have for each $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ and $t \le 0$,

$$\|\mathcal{I}(\xi, x, \omega, \tau)(t)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \le e^{-\lambda_n t}\|A^\alpha x\| + \int_t^0 e^{-\lambda_n(t-s)}\left(\lambda_n^\alpha\|F(\xi + z(\theta_s\omega))\| + \|A^\alpha g(s+\tau)\|\right)ds$$

$$+ \int_{-\infty}^t \left(\frac{\alpha^\alpha}{(t-s)^\alpha} + \lambda_{n+1}^\alpha\right)e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-s)}\|F(\xi + z(\theta_s\omega))\|ds + \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-s)}\|A^\alpha g(s+\tau)\|ds. \tag{3.28}$$

By (3.2) and (3.17) we have for all $t \le 0$,

$$e^{\mu t}\int_t^0 e^{-\lambda_n(t-s)}\left(\lambda_n^\alpha\|F(\xi + z(\theta_s\omega))\| + \|A^\alpha g(s+\tau)\|\right)ds$$

$$\le L\lambda_n^\alpha\|\xi + z\|_{\mathcal{S}}\int_t^0 e^{(\mu-\lambda_n)(t-s)}ds + \int_t^0 e^{(\mu-\lambda_n)t}e^{\lambda_n s}\|A^\alpha g(s+\tau)\|ds$$

$$\le \frac{\lambda_n^\alpha L}{\mu - \lambda_n}\|\xi + z\|_{\mathcal{S}} + \int_t^0 e^{\lambda_1 s}\|A^\alpha g(s+\tau)\|ds. \tag{3.29}$$

Similarly, for all $t \le 0$ we get

$$e^{\mu t}\int_{-\infty}^t \left(\frac{\alpha^\alpha}{(t-s)^\alpha} + \lambda_{n+1}^\alpha\right)e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-s)}\|F(\xi(s) + z(\theta_s\omega))\|ds$$

$$\le L\|\xi + z\|_{\mathcal{S}}\int_{-\infty}^t \left(\frac{\alpha^\alpha}{(t-s)^\alpha} + \lambda_{n+1}^\alpha\right)e^{(\mu-\lambda_{n+1})(t-s)}ds$$

$$\leq L(\lambda_{n+1}-\mu)^{-1}\left(\lambda_{n+1}^{\alpha}+c_{\alpha}(\lambda_{n+1}-\mu)^{\alpha}\right)\|\xi+z\|_{\mathcal{S}}. \tag{3.30}$$

In addition, by (3.4) and (3.17) we have for $t\leq 0$,

$$e^{\mu t}\int_{-\infty}^{t}e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-s)}\|A^{\alpha}g(s+\tau)\|ds\leq\int_{-\infty}^{t}e^{(\mu-\lambda_{n+1})(t-s)}e^{\mu s}\|A^{\alpha}g(s+\tau)\|ds$$

$$\leq\int_{-\infty}^{t}e^{\lambda_1 s}\|A^{\alpha}g(s+\tau)\|ds<\infty. \tag{3.31}$$

Since $\lambda_{n+1}-\mu\leq\lambda_{n+1}-\lambda_n$ by (3.17), it follows from (3.28)-(3.31) that

$$\|\mathcal{I}(\xi,x,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}\leq\left(\frac{\lambda_n^{\alpha}}{\mu-\lambda_n}+\frac{\lambda_{n+1}^{\alpha}+c_{\alpha}(\lambda_{n+1}-\lambda_n)^{\alpha}}{\lambda_{n+1}-\mu}\right)\|\xi+z\|_{\mathcal{S}}+\|A^{\alpha}x\|$$

$$+\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\lambda_1 s}\|A^{\alpha}g(s+\tau)\|ds\leq k\|\xi+z\|_{\mathcal{S}}+\|A^{\alpha}x\|+\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\lambda_1 s}\|A^{\alpha}g(s+\tau)\|ds, \tag{3.32}$$

where the last inequality follows from (3.16). Therefore, we have $\mathcal{I}(\xi,x,\omega,\tau)\in\mathcal{S}$. □

We now establish existence of fixed points of $\mathcal{I}$ in $\mathcal{S}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose* (3.1), (3.3) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold. Then for every* $x\in P_nH$, $\omega\in\Omega$ *and* $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{I}(\cdot,x,\omega,\tau):\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{S}$ *has a unique fixed point which is Lipschitz continuous in* $x\in P_nH$.

Proof. Given $\xi_1,\xi_2\in\mathcal{S}$, following the proof of Lemma 3.3, one can verify

$$\|\mathcal{I}(\xi_1,x,\omega,\tau)-\mathcal{I}(\xi_2,x,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}\leq k\|\xi_1-\xi_2\|_{\mathcal{S}}. \tag{3.33}$$

Since $k\in(0,1)$, by (3.33) we find that $\mathcal{I}(\cdot,x,\omega,\tau)$ has a unique fixed point $\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)$ in $\mathcal{S}$. For every $t\leq 0$, $\xi^*(x,\cdot,\tau)(t):\Omega\to D(A^{\alpha})$ is measurable since it is a limit of iterations of measurable functions staring at zero. In addition, by (3.32) we have

$$(1-k)\|\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}\leq k\|z(\theta_s\omega)\|_{\mathcal{S}}+\|A^{\alpha}x\|+\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\lambda_1 s}\|A^{\alpha}g(s+\tau)\|ds. \tag{3.34}$$

We now prove the continuity of ξ^* in $x\in P_nH$. Let $\xi_1^*=\xi^*(x_1,\omega,\tau)$ and $\xi_2^*=\xi^*(x_2,\omega,\tau)$. By (3.17), (3.27) and (3.33) we have

$$\|\xi_1^*-\xi_2^*\|_{\mathcal{S}}=\|\mathcal{I}(\xi_1^*,x_1,\omega,\tau)-\mathcal{I}(\xi_2^*,x_2,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}$$

$$\leq\|\mathcal{I}(\xi_1^*,x_1,\omega,\tau)-\mathcal{I}(\xi_1^*,x_2,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}+\|\mathcal{I}(\xi_1^*,x_2,\omega,\tau)-\mathcal{I}(\xi_2^*,x_2,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}$$

$$\leq\sup_{t\leq 0}e^{(\mu-\lambda_n)t}\|x_1-x_2\|_{D(A^{\alpha})}+k\|\xi_1^*-\xi_2^*\|_{\mathcal{S}}\leq\|x_1-x_2\|_{D(A^{\alpha})}+k\|\xi_1^*-\xi_2^*\|_{\mathcal{S}}. \tag{3.35}$$

This implies the Lipschitz continuity of ξ^* in x. □

By the fixed point ξ^* established by Lemma 3.4, for each $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, we can define a mapping $m(\tau,\omega) : P_nH \to Q_nD(A^\alpha)$ by

$$m(\tau,\omega)(x) = Q_n\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)(0) = \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{As}Q_n\left(F(\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s+\tau)\right)ds \tag{3.36}$$

for $x \in P_nH$. It follows from (3.35) that

$$\|m(\tau,\omega)(x_1) - m(\tau,\omega)(x_2)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \le \frac{1}{1-k}\|x_1 - x_2\|_{D(A^\alpha)}. \tag{3.37}$$

By (3.34) and (3.36) we get

$$\|m(\tau,\omega)(x)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \le \frac{k}{1-k}\|z(\theta_s\omega)\|_{\mathcal{S}} + \frac{1}{1-k}\|A^\alpha x\| + \frac{1}{1-k}\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda_1 s}\|A^\alpha g(s+\tau)\|ds. \tag{3.38}$$

By (3.18), (3.36) and Lemma 3.2 we find that for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega) = \{\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)(0) : x \in P_nH\} = \{x + m(\tau,\omega)(x) : x \in P_nH\}. \tag{3.39}$$

Since $m(\tau,\omega)(x)$ is measurable in ω and continuous in x, the measurability of $\mathcal{M}(\tau,\cdot)$ follows.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose* (3.1), (3.3) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold. Then* $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ *given by* (3.18) *is a Lipschitz invariant manifold of* (3.14).

Proof. Given $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, by (3.39), $\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$ is the graph of $m(\tau,\omega)$ which is Lipschitz continuous by Lemma 3.4. Next, we show the invariance of $\mathcal{M}$. Given $t > 0$ and $v_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$, by (3.18) there exists $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\xi(0) = v_0$ and ξ is a solution of (3.14) on $(-\infty, 0]$. Let

$$\widetilde{\xi}(r) = \begin{cases} v(r+t, 0, \omega, g^\tau, \xi(0)) & \text{if} \quad -t \le r \le 0; \\ \xi(r+t) & \text{if} \quad r < -t. \end{cases} \tag{3.40}$$

Note that $\widetilde{\xi} \in \mathcal{S}$ since $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$. By straightforward calculations, one can verify, for all $r_2 \le r_1 \le 0$,

$$v(r_1, r_2, \theta_t\omega, g^{\tau+t}, \widetilde{\xi}(r_2)) = \widetilde{\xi}(r_1), \tag{3.41}$$

where $v(r_1, r_2, \theta_t\omega, g^{\tau+t}, \widetilde{\xi}(r_2))$ is given by (3.15) with ω and g^τ replaced by $\theta_t\omega$ and $g^{\tau+t}$, respectively. By (3.18) and (3.41) we find that $\widetilde{\xi}(0) \in \mathcal{M}(\tau+t, \theta_t\omega)$, which along with (3.10) and (3.40) indicates that $\Psi(t,\tau,\omega,v_0) = v(t,0,\omega,g^\tau,v_0) \in \mathcal{M}(\tau+t,\theta_t\omega)$ for all $v_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$, and hence

$$\Psi(t,\tau,\omega,\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\tau+t,\theta_t\omega), \quad \text{for all} \ \ t \ge 0. \tag{3.42}$$

On the other hand, for every $v_0 \in \mathcal{M}(\tau+t,\theta_t\omega)$, by (3.18) there exists $\xi \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\xi(0) = v_0$ and for all $s_2 \le s_1 \le 0$,

$$v(s_1, s_2, \theta_t\omega, g^{\tau+t}, \xi(s_2)) = \xi(s_1). \tag{3.43}$$

Let $\widetilde{\xi}:(-\infty,0]\to D(A^\alpha)$ be given by

$$\widetilde{\xi}(r)=\xi(r-t)\ \text{ for all }\ r\le 0. \tag{3.44}$$

Then $\widetilde{\xi}\in\mathcal{S}$, and by (3.43)-(3.44), we have for $t\ge 0$ and for all $r_2\le r_1\le 0$,

$$\widetilde{\xi}(r_1)=\xi(r_1-t)=v(r_1-t,r_2-t,\theta_t\omega,g^{\tau+t},\xi(r_2-t))=v(r_1,r_2,\omega,g^\tau,\widetilde{\xi}(r_2)). \tag{3.45}$$

By (3.45), (3.44) and (3.18) we find that $\widetilde{\xi}(0)=\xi(-t)\in\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$. By (3.10) and (3.43) we get

$$\Psi(t,\tau,\omega,\xi(-t))=v(t+\tau,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,g,\xi(-t))=v(0,-t,\theta_t\omega,g^{\tau+t},\xi(-t))=\xi(0). \tag{3.46}$$

Since $\xi(-t)\in\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$ and $\xi(0)=v_0$ where v_0 is an arbitrary given point in $\mathcal{M}(\tau+t,\theta_t\omega)$, by (3.46) we obtain

$$\mathcal{M}(\tau+t,\theta_t\omega)\subseteq\Psi(t,\tau,\omega,\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)),\quad\text{for all }\ t\ge 0. \tag{3.47}$$

Then the invariance of $\mathcal{M}$ follows from (3.42) and (3.47) immediately. □

The next result is concerned with the exponential attraction property of $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose* (3.1), (3.3) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold with* $k\in(0,\frac{1}{2})$. *Then for every* $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$, $\omega\in\Omega$ *and* $v_0\in D(A^\alpha)$, *there exists a random variable* $v_0^*(\tau,\omega)\in\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$ *such that for all* $t\ge 0$,

$$\|\Psi(t,\tau,\omega,v_0^*)-\Psi(t,\tau,\omega,v_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}\le\frac{1}{1-\delta}e^{-\mu t}\|Q_nv_0-m(\tau,\omega)(P_nv_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)},$$

where $\delta=k+\frac{k}{2-2k}\in(0,1)$ *for* $0<k<\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. We argue as in [5]. Let $\mathcal{S}^+=\{\xi\in C([0,\infty),D(A^\alpha)):\sup_{t\ge0}e^{\mu t}\|A^\alpha\xi(t)\|<\infty\}$ with norm $\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{S}^+}=\sup_{t\ge0}e^{\mu t}\|A^\alpha\xi(t)\|$. We will find $v_0^*\in\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$ such that $v(t,0,\omega,g^\tau,v_0^*)-v(t,0,\omega,g^\tau,v_0)\in\mathcal{S}^+$. To that end, we need to solve the the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\xi(t)=e^{-At}y_0&+\int_0^t e^{-A(t-s)}Q_n\left(F(\xi(s)+z(\theta_s\omega)+v(s))-F(v(s)+z(\theta_s\omega))\right)ds\\&-\int_t^\infty e^{-A(t-s)}P_n\left(F(\xi(s)+z(\theta_s\omega)+v(s))-F(v(s)+z(\theta_s\omega))\right)ds,\end{aligned} \tag{3.48}$$

where $v(s)=v(s,0,\omega,g^\tau,v_0)$ and y_0 is determined by

$$y_0=-Q_nv_0+m(\tau,\omega)\left(P_nv_0-\int_0^\infty e^{As}P_n(F(\xi+v+z(\theta_s\omega))-F(v+z(\theta_s\omega)))ds\right). \tag{3.49}$$

Given $\xi\in\mathcal{S}^+$, denote the right-hand side of (3.48) by $\mathcal{I}^+(\xi)$. We will find a fixed point of $\mathcal{I}^+$ in $\mathcal{S}^+$. By (3.5)-(3.7) and (3.1) we get for $t\ge0$ and $\xi\in\mathcal{S}^+$,

$$e^{\mu t}\|A^\alpha\mathcal{I}^+(\xi)(t)\|\le e^{(\mu-\lambda_{n+1})t}\|A^\alpha y_0\|+Le^{\mu t}\int_t^\infty\lambda_n^\alpha e^{-\lambda_n(t-s)}\|A^\alpha\xi(s)\|ds$$

$$+Le^{\mu t}\int_0^t\left(\frac{\alpha^\alpha}{(t-s)^\alpha}+\lambda_{n+1}^\alpha\right)e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-s)}\|A^\alpha\xi(s)\|ds$$

$$\le\|A^\alpha y_0\|+L\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{S}^+}\left(\frac{\lambda_n^\alpha}{\mu-\lambda_n}+\frac{\lambda_{n+1}^\alpha}{\lambda_{n+1}-\mu}+c_\alpha(\lambda_{n+1}-\mu)^{\alpha-1}\right). \tag{3.50}$$

By (3.49), (3.37), (3.5) and (3.1) we get

$$\|A^\alpha y_0\|\le\|-Q_nv_0+m(\tau,\omega)(P_nv_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}$$

$$+\|m(\tau,\omega)(P_nv_0)-m(\tau,\omega)\left(P_nv_0-\int_0^\infty e^{As}P_n(F(\xi+v+z(\theta_s\omega))-F(v+z(\theta_s\omega)))ds\right)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}$$

$$\le\|Q_nv_0-m(\tau,\omega)(P_nv_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}+\frac{1}{1-k}\int_0^\infty\|e^{As}P_n(F(\xi+v+z)-F(v+z))ds\|_{D(A^\alpha)}$$

$$\le\|Q_nv_0-m(\tau,\omega)(P_nv_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}+\frac{L\lambda_n^\alpha}{1-k}\int_0^\infty e^{(\lambda_n-\mu)s}e^{\mu s}\|A^\alpha\xi(s)\|ds$$

$$\le\|Q_nv_0-m(\tau,\omega)(P_nv_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}+\frac{L\lambda_n^\alpha}{(1-k)(\mu-\lambda_n)}\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{S}^+}. \tag{3.51}$$

It follows from (3.50)-(3.51) and (3.16)-(3.17) that

$$\|\mathcal{I}^+(\xi)\|_{\mathcal{S}^+}\le\|Q_nv_0-m(\tau,\omega)(P_nv_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}$$

$$+L\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{S}^+}\left(\frac{(2-k)\lambda_n^\alpha}{(1-k)(\mu-\lambda_n)}+\frac{\lambda_{n+1}^\alpha}{\lambda_{n+1}-\mu}+c_\alpha(\lambda_{n+1}-\mu)^{\alpha-1}\right)$$

$$\le\|Q_nv_0-m(\tau,\omega)(P_nv_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}+\delta\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{S}^+},\quad\text{with}\quad\delta=k+\frac{k}{2-2k}. \tag{3.52}$$

This shows that $\mathcal{I}^+$ maps $\mathcal{S}^+$ into itself. Note that for $\xi_1,\xi_2\in\mathcal{S}^+$, we have

$$\|\mathcal{I}^+(\xi_1)-\mathcal{I}^+(\xi_2)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}\le\|e^{-At}y_{0,1}-e^{-At}y_{0,2}\|_{D(A^\alpha)}$$

$$+\int_0^t\|e^{-A(t-s)}Q_n(F(\xi_1+z+v)-F(\xi_2+z+v))\|_{D(A^\alpha)}ds$$

$$+\int_t^\infty\|e^{-A(t-s)}P_n(F(\xi_1+z+v)-F(\xi_2+z+v))\|_{D(A^\alpha)}ds.$$

Following the proof of (3) we can get

$$\|\mathcal{I}^+(\xi_1)-\mathcal{I}^+(\xi_2)\|_{\mathcal{S}^+}\le\delta\|\xi_1-\xi_2\|_{\mathcal{S}^+} \tag{3.53}$$

where δ is given in (3) and $\delta\in(0,1)$ for $k\in(0,\frac{1}{2})$. Since $\mathcal{I}^+:\mathcal{S}^+\to\mathcal{S}^+$ is a contraction by (3.53), it has a unique fixed point ξ in $\mathcal{S}^+$ which satisfies (3.48)-(3.49). This fixed point is measurable since it can be obtained by a limit of iterations of measurable functions. Further, by (3) we obtain

$$\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{S}^+}=\|\mathcal{I}^+\|_{\mathcal{S}^+}\le\|Q_nv_0-m(\tau,\omega)(P_nv_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}+\delta\|\xi\|_{\mathcal{S}^+}$$

and hence the fixed point ξ satisfies, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\|\xi(t)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \leq \frac{1}{1-\delta} e^{-\mu t} \|Q_n v_0 - m(\tau,\omega)(P_n v_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}. \tag{3.54}$$

By (3.48) we have

$$\xi(0) = y_0 - \int_0^\infty e^{As} P_n \left(F(\xi + z + v) - F(v + z)\right) ds. \tag{3.55}$$

By (3.48) and (3.55) we get

$$\xi(t) = e^{-At}\xi(0) + \int_0^t e^{-A(t-s)} \left(F(\xi + z + v) - F(v + z)\right) ds. \tag{3.56}$$

Note that $v(t, 0, \omega, g^\tau, v_0)$ is a solution of (3.14) with $r = 0$, which along with (3.56) implies that $v^*(t) = \xi(t) + v(t, 0, \omega, g^\tau, v_0)$ satisfies

$$v^*(t) = e^{-At}v^*(0) + \int_0^t e^{-A(t-s)}(F(v^*(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) + g(s + \tau))ds \ \text{ with } v^*(0) = \xi(0) + v_0.$$

This shows that $v^*(t)$ is a solution of (3.14) with initial condition $v^*(0)$. By the uniqueness of solutions, we have $v^*(t) = v(t, 0, \omega, g^\tau, v^*(0))$. Since $\xi(t) = v(t, 0, \omega, g^\tau, v^*(0)) - v(t, 0, \omega, g^\tau, v_0)$, by (3.54) we get for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\|v(t, 0, \omega, g^\tau, v^*(0)) - v(t, 0, \omega, g^\tau, v_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \leq \frac{1}{1-\delta} e^{-\mu t} \|Q_n v_0 - m(\tau,\omega)(P_n v_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}. \tag{3.57}$$

By (3.55) and (3.49) we get $v^*(0) = \xi(0) + v_0 = x_0 + m(\tau,\omega)(x_0) \in \mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega)$ where $x_0 = P_n v_0 - \int_0^\infty e^{As} P_n (F(v^* + z) - F(v + z))ds$, which along with (3.57) completes the proof. □

As an immediate consequence of Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, we obtain the existence of inertial manifolds for equation (3.9).

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose* (3.1), (3.3) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold with* $k \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. *Then the cocycle* Ψ *defined by* (3.10) *for equation* (3.9) *has an inertial manifold* $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ *as given by* (3.18) *and* (3.39).

Based on Corollary 3.7, we are able to establish the existence of inertial manifolds for the non-autonomous stochastic equation (1.1).

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose* (3.1), (3.3) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold with* $k \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. *Then the cocycle* Φ *defined by* (3.12) *for equation* (1.1) *has an inertial manifold* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = \{\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau,\omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ *which is given by, for each* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau,\omega) = \{x + z(\omega) + m(\tau,\omega)(x) : x \in P_n H\} = \mathcal{M}(\tau,\omega) + z(\omega). \tag{3.58}$$

Proof. Given $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $x \in P_n H$, let $y = x + P_n z(\omega)$. Then we have

$$x + z(\omega) + m(\tau, \omega)(x) = y + Q_n z(\omega) + m(\tau, \omega)(y - P_n z(\omega)),$$

which along with (3.58) implies

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau, \omega) = \{y + Q_n z(\omega) + m(\tau, \omega)(y - P_n z(\omega)) : y \in P_n H\} = \{y + \widetilde{m}(\tau, \omega)(y) : y \in P_n H\} \quad (3.59)$$

where

$$\widetilde{m}(\tau, \omega)(\cdot) = Q_n z(\omega) + m(\tau, \omega)(\cdot - P_n z(\omega)) \quad (3.60)$$

is a Lipschitz map from $P_n H$ to $Q_n H$. By (3.13), (3.58) and the invariance of $\mathcal{M}$ under Ψ we get

$$\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau, \omega)) = \{\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, x + z(\omega) + m(\tau, \omega)(x) : x \in P_n H\}$$

$$= \{\Psi(t, \tau, \omega, x + m(\tau, \omega)(x) + z(\theta_t \omega) : x \in P_n H\} = \Psi(t, \tau, \omega, \mathcal{M}(\tau, \omega)) + z(\theta_t \omega)$$

$$= \mathcal{M}(\tau + t, \theta_t \omega) + z(\theta_t \omega) = \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau + t, \theta_t \omega), \quad (3.61)$$

where the last equality follows from (3.58) again. Therefore, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is invariant under Φ. Finally, we prove the attraction property of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Given $u_0 \in D(A^\alpha)$, let $v_0 = u_0 - z(\omega)$. By Lemma 3.6, there exists a random variable $v_0^*(\tau, \omega) \in \mathcal{M}(\tau, \omega)$ such that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\|\Psi(t, \tau, \omega, v_0^*) - \Psi(t, \tau, \omega, v_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \delta} e^{-\mu t} \|Q_n v_0 - m(\tau, \omega)(P_n v_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}. \quad (3.62)$$

Let $u_0^* = v_0^* + z(\omega)$. Since $v_0^* \in \mathcal{M}(\tau, \omega)$, by (3.58) we find $u_0^* \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau, \omega)$. By (3.13) we get

$$\|\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, u_0^*) - \Phi(t, \tau, \omega, u_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} = \|\Psi(t, \tau, \omega, v_0^*) - \Psi(t, \tau, \omega, v_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}$$

which along with (3.62) yields

$$\|\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, u_0^*) - \Phi(t, \tau, \omega, u_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \delta} e^{-\mu t} \|Q_n u_0 - \widetilde{m}(\tau, \omega)(P_n u_0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}. \quad (3.63)$$

By (3.59), (3.61) and (3.63) we conclude the proof. □

We now establish relations between tempered random attractors and inertial manifolds. Recall that a tempered family $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ of nonempty compact subsets of $D(A^\alpha)$ is called a tempered random pullback attractor of Φ if $\mathcal{A}$ is measurable, invariant, and pullback attracts all tempered family of bounded subsets of $D(A^\alpha)$ (see, e.g., [16] and the references therein). Based on this notation, the random inertial manifold constructed in Theorem 3.8 must contain tempered random attractors as subsets.

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose* (3.1), (3.3) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold with* $k \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. *If* Φ *has a tempered pullback random attractor* $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}(\tau,\omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}$ *in* $D(A^\alpha)$, *then we have* $\mathcal{A}(\tau,\omega) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau,\omega)$ *for all* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\omega \in \Omega$, *where* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau,\omega)$ *is given by* (3.58).

Proof. Given $u \in \mathcal{A}(\tau,\omega)$ and $t_m \to \infty$, by the invariance of $\mathcal{A}$, we find that for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $u_m \in \mathcal{A}(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)$ such that

$$u = \Phi(t_m, \tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega, u_m). \tag{3.64}$$

By (3.63), there exists $u_m^* \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Phi(t_m, \tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega, u_m^*) - \Phi(t_m, \tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega, u_m)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \\ &\le \frac{1}{1-\delta} e^{-\mu t_m} \|Q_n u_m - \widetilde{m}(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)(P_n u_m)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

Since $u_m^* \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)$, by the invariance of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ we have $\Phi(t_m, \tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega, u_m^*) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau,\omega)$. By (3.59) we may write $\Phi(t_m, \tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega, u_m^*) = x_m + \widetilde{m}(\tau,\omega)(x_m)$ for some $x_m \in P_n H$. This along with (3.64)-(3) implies

$$\|(x_m - P_n u) + (\widetilde{m}(\tau,\omega)(x_m) - Q_n u)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \le \frac{1}{1-\delta} e^{-\mu t_m} \|Q_n u_m - \widetilde{m}(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)(P_n u_m)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}. \tag{3.66}$$

By (3.60), (3.38) and $u_m \in \mathcal{A}(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_n u_m - \widetilde{m}(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)(P_n u_m)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} &\le \|u_m\|_{D(A^\alpha)} + \|\widetilde{m}(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)(P_n u_m)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \\ &\le \|u_m\|_{D(A^\alpha)} + \|A^\alpha z(\theta_{-t_m}\omega)\| + \|m(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)(P_n(u_m - z(\theta_{-t_m}\omega)))\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \\ &\le \frac{2-k}{1-k}\|u_m\|_{D(A^\alpha)} + \frac{2-k}{1-k}\|A^\alpha z(\theta_{-t_m}\omega)\| \\ &+ \frac{k}{1-k}\sup_{r\le 0} e^{\mu r}\|z(\theta_{r-t_m}\omega)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} + \frac{1}{1-k}\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\lambda_1 s}\|g(s+\tau-t_m)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}ds \\ &\le \frac{2-k}{1-k}\|\mathcal{A}(\tau - t_m, \theta_{-t_m}\omega)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} + \frac{2-k}{1-k}\|z(\theta_{-t_m}\omega)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \\ &+ \frac{k}{1-k}e^{\mu t_m}\sup_{s\le -t_m} e^{\mu s}\|z(\theta_s\omega)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} + \frac{e^{\mu t_m}}{1-k}\int_{-\infty}^{-t_m} e^{\lambda_1 r}\|g(r+\tau)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.67}$$

Taking the limit of (3.66) as $m \to \infty$, by (3.67), (3.4) and the temperedness of $\mathcal{A}$ and z, we get

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \|(x_m - P_n u) + (\widetilde{m}(\tau,\omega)(x_m) - Q_n u)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} = 0$$

which implies $x_m \to P_n u$ and $\widetilde{m}(\tau,\omega)(x_m) \to Q_n u$. By the continuity of $\widetilde{m}(\tau,\omega)$ we obtain $Q_n u = \widetilde{m}(\tau,\omega)(P_n u)$ and hence $u \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau,\omega)$ for any $u \in \mathcal{A}(\tau,\omega)$ as desired. □

4 Periodicity and Almost Periodicity of Inertial Manifolds

In this section, we assume the external function g in (1.1) is time periodic or almost periodic, and establish the pathwise periodicity or almost periodicity of the random inertial manifolds constructed in the previous section. If $g : \mathbb{R} \to D(A^\alpha)$ is almost periodic, then g must be bounded; that is, $\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \|g(t)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} < \infty$. Therefore, in this case, condition (3.3) is trivially fulfilled.

The main results of this section are given below.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose* (3.1) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold with* $k \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. *If* $g : \mathbb{R} \to D(A^\alpha)$ *is almost periodic, then* Φ *has an almost periodic random inertial manifold* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau, \omega)$ *as given by* (3.58).

Proof. By the almost periodicity of g, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive number $l = l(\varepsilon)$ such that any interval of length l contains a point τ_0 such that

$$\|g(r + \tau_0) - g(r)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \le \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(1 - k)\lambda_n, \quad \text{for all} \quad r \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.1}$$

Based on (4.1) we will prove

$$\sup_{x\in P_nH} \|\widetilde{m}(\tau + \tau_0, \omega)(x) - \widetilde{m}(\tau, \omega)(x)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \le \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all} \quad \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.2}$$

which will complete the proof. Let $\xi^*(x, \omega, r)$ be the unique fixed point of $\mathcal{I}(\cdot, x, \omega, r)$ given by (3.27) for every fixed $x \in P_nH$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Then by (3.27), (3.5)-(3.7), (3.1) and (4.1) we get for $t \le 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{\mu t}\|\xi^*(x, \omega, \tau + \tau_0)(t) - \xi^*(x, \omega, \tau)(t)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \\
&= e^{\mu t}\|\mathcal{I}(\xi^*(x, \omega, \tau + \tau_0), x, \omega, \tau + \tau_0) - \mathcal{I}(\xi^*(x, \omega, \tau), x, \omega, \tau)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \\
&\le \int_t^0 e^{\mu t}\|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)}P_n(F(\xi^*(x, \omega, \tau + \tau_0)(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) - F(\xi^*(x, \omega, \tau)(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)))\|ds \\
&+ \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\mu t}\|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)}Q_n(F(\xi^*(x, \omega, \tau + \tau_0)(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)) - F(\xi^*(x, \omega, \tau)(s) + z(\theta_s\omega)))\|ds \\
&+ e^{\mu t}\int_t^0 \|e^{-A(t-s)}P_nA^\alpha(g(s+\tau+\tau_0) - g(s+\tau))\|ds + e^{\mu t}\int_{-\infty}^t \|e^{-A(t-s)}Q_nA^\alpha(g(s+\tau+\tau_0) - g(s+\tau))\| \\
&\le L\|\xi^*(x, \omega, \tau+\tau_0) - \xi^*(x, \omega, \tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}} \left(\lambda_n^\alpha \int_t^0 e^{(\mu-\lambda_n)(t-s)}ds + \int_{-\infty}^t \left(\frac{\alpha^\alpha}{(t-s)^\alpha} + \lambda_{n+1}^\alpha\right)e^{(\mu-\lambda_{n+1})(t-s)}ds\right) \\
&+ e^{\mu t}\int_t^0 e^{-\lambda_n(t-s)}\|g(s+\tau+\tau_0) - g(s+\tau)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}ds + \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-s)}\|g(s+\tau+\tau_0) - g(s+\tau)\|_{D(A^\alpha)} \\
&\le L\left(\frac{\lambda_n^\alpha}{\mu - \lambda_n} + \frac{\lambda_{n+1}^\alpha + c_\alpha(\lambda_{n+1} - \mu)^\alpha}{\lambda_{n+1} - \mu}\right)\|\xi^*(x, \omega, \tau + \tau_0) - \xi^*(x, \omega, \tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(1-k)\lambda_n e^{\mu t}\int_t^0 e^{-\lambda_n(t-s)}ds+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(1-k)\lambda_n\int_{-\infty}^t e^{-\lambda_{n+1}(t-s)}ds. \tag{4.3}$$

Since $t\leq 0$ and $\mu\in(\lambda_n,\lambda_{n+1})$, the last integral in (4.3) is bounded by $\varepsilon(1-k)$, which together with (3.16) and (4.3) implies

$$\|\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau+\tau_0)-\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}\leq k\|\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau+\tau_0)-\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}+\varepsilon(1-k). \tag{4.4}$$

Thus we get $\|\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau+\tau_0)-\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}\leq\varepsilon$ and hence $\|\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau+\tau_0)(0)-\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)(0)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}\leq\varepsilon$. Since $\xi^*(x,\omega,r)(0)=x+m(r,\omega)x$ for all $r\in\mathbb{R}$, we obtain $\|m(\tau+\tau_0,\omega)(x)-m(\tau,\omega)(x)\|_{D(A^\alpha)}\leq\varepsilon$ for all $x\in P_nH$, which along with (3.60) yields (4.2), and thus completes the proof. □

Finally, we present the pathwise periodicity of random inertial manifolds.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose* (3.1) *and* (3.16)-(3.17) *hold with* $k\in(0,\frac{1}{2})$. *If* $g:\mathbb{R}\to D(A^\alpha)$ *is periodic with period* $T>0$, *then* Φ *has a* T*-periodic random inertial manifold* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\tau,\omega)$ *as given by* (3.58).

Proof. Following the arguments of (4.4), we obtain in the present case that

$$\|\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau+T)-\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}\leq k\|\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau+T)-\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}.$$

Since $k\in(0,1)$ we get $\|\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau+T)-\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}}=0$, and hence $\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau+T)(0)=\xi^*(x,\omega,\tau)(0)$. As a consequence, we get $m(\tau+T,\omega)=m(\tau,\omega)$ and thus $\widetilde{m}(\tau+T,\omega)=\widetilde{m}(\tau,\omega)$. □

References

[1] L. Arnold, *Random Dynamical Systems*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[2] A. Bensoussan and F. Flandoli, Stochastic inertial manifold, *Stochastics and Stochastic Rep.*, **53** (1995), 13-39.

[3] P. Brune and B. Schmalfuss, Inertial manifolds for stochastic PDE with dynamical boundary conditions, *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis*, **10** (2011), 831-846.

[4] T. Caraballo, J. Duan, K. Lu and B. Schmalfuss, Invariant manifolds for random and stochastic partial differential equations, *Advanced Nonlinear Studies*, **10** (2010), 23-52.

[5] I. Chueshov and M. Scheutzow, Inertial manifolds and forms for stochastically perturbed retarded semilinear parabolic equations, *J. Dynamics and Differential Equations*, **13** (2001), 355-380.

[6] I. Chueshov, M. Scheutzow and B. Schmalfuss, Continuity properties of inertial manifolds for stochastic retarded semilinear parabolic equations, 353-375, in *Interacting Stochastic Systems* by J. Deuschel and A. Greven, 2005, Springer, Berlin.

[7] I. Chueshov and T. Girya, Inertial manifolds for stochastic dissipative dynamical systems, *Doklady Acad. Sci. Ukraine*, **7** (1994), 42-45.

[8] I. Chueshov and T. Girya, Inertial manifolds and forms for semilinear parabolic equations subjected to additive white noise, *Lett. Math. Phys.*, **34** (1995), 69-76.

[9] J. Duan, K. Lu and B. Schmalfuss, Invariant manifolds for stochastic partial differential equations, *Ann. Probab.*, **31** (2003), 2109-2135.

[10] J. Duan, K. Lu and B. Schmalfuss, Smooth stable and unstable manifolds for stochastic evolutionary equations, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, **16** (2004), 949-972.

[11] M. J. Garrido-Atienza, K. Lu and B. Schmalfuss, Unstable invariant manifolds for stochastic PDEs driven by a fractional Brownian motion, *J. Differential Equations*, **248** (2010), 1637-1667.

[12] T. Girya and I. Chueshov, Inertial manifolds and stationary measures for stochastically perturbed dissipative dynamical systems, *Sbornik: Mathematics*, **186** (1995), 29-46.

[13] Z. Lian and K. Lu, Lyapunov exponents and invariant manifolds for infinite-dimensional random dynamical systems in a Banach space, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **206** (2010), No. 967, 1-106.

[14] K. Lu and B. Schmalfuss, Invariant manifolds for stochastic wave equations, *J. Differential Equations*, **236** (2007), 460-492.

[15] S.-E. A. Mohammed and M.K.R. Scheutzow, The stable manifold theorem for stochastic differential equations, *Ann. Probab.*, **27** (1999), 615-652.

[16] B. Wang, Sufficient and necessary criteria for existence of pullback attractors for non-compact random dynamical systems, *J. Differential Equations*, **253** (2012), 1544-1583.

[17] T. Wanner, Linearization of random dynamical systems, *Dynamics Reported*, **4** (1995), 203-269.

[18] T. Yoshizawa, Stability Theory and the Existence of Periodic Solutions and Almost Periodic Solutions, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975.